U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT Anchorage Field Office

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION (CX) FORM

| Document No.: AK-040-CX-01-019 | Lease/Serial/Case File No. AA-80608 |
|--|--|
| Proposed Action Title/Types: Federal A | gency Right-of-Way Renewal |
| Location of Proposed Action: Lot 17, U R. 20 W., Seward Meridian | S. Survey No. 2359, further described as T. 28 S., |
| the Fort Greeley Road Garrison - Buskin and twelve soil gas test points. The well presence of chemicals resulting from the | roposed Action is to continue ground water monitoring in a Beach area with existing facilities: four micro-wells als and soil gas test points are being used to identify the expresence of underground storage tanks that have since sturbance will occur. The original terms and conditions ed. |
| Applicant (if any): U.S. Army Engineer | District, Alaska |
| | N CONFORMANCE REVIEW |
| This Proposed Action is subject to the fo | ollowing land use plan: See Remarks below: |
| Date Plan Approved: | |
| The Proposed Action has been reviewed MS 1617.3). | for conformance with this plan (43 CFR 1610.5, BLM |

Remarks:

No BLM land use plan exists for the Kodiak area. During the week of September 22, 1997, AFO management made a decision to accept the Environmental Assessment (EA) written by the Corps dated July 18, 1997. In the Corps' EA there was a Finding of No Significant Impact to support the Corps NEPA analysis. After reviewing the document, there was no specific reference in the EA to the drilling or monitoring of four micro wells and 12 soil gas test points. The EA did address the long term goals of the project which was to improve the area's soil and water quality. The AFO evaluated the drilling and the installation of the four monitoring wells and the 12 soil gas test points under a categorical exclusion. After AFO management review, it was determined that the project would be processed as a categorical exclusion under 516 DM 6, Appendix 5.4, H-3.

PART II - NEPA REVIEW

| A. | This P | orical Exclusion Review. Proposed Action qualifies as a categorical exclusion under 516 DM 2, Ap 5 DM 6, Appendix 5.4. H-3. | pendix | x 1 |
|----|---|---|--------|---------------------------|
| В. | Departmental Exceptions Review. The following Departmental List of Exceptions apply to individual actions. Departmental instructions mandate that environmental documents MUST BE PREPARED for actions which may: (Mark applicable answer for each item. prepare an EA/EIS and append this form to it.) | | | |
| | 1. | Have significant adverse impacts on public health or safety. | YES | <u>X</u> |
| | 2. | Have adverse effects on unique geographic characteristics, historic or cultural resources, park, recreation or refuge lands, wilderness areas, wild or scenic rivers, sole or principal drinking water aquifers, prime farmlands, wetlands, flood plains, or ecologically significant or critical areas, including those listed on the Department's National Register of Natural Landmarks. | | X |
| | 3. | Have highly controversial environmental effects. | | X |
| | 4. | Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks. | | _ <u></u> _ <u>X</u> _ |
| | 5. | Establish a precedent for future actions or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects. | | <u>X</u> |
| | 6. | Be directly related to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant environmental effects. | | <u>X</u> |
| | 7. | Have adverse effects on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. | | <u>X</u> |
| | 8. | Have adverse effects on species listed or proposed to be listed on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have adverse effects on designated critical habitat for these species. | | _X_ |
| | 9. | Require compliance with Executive Order 11988 (Flood plain Management), Executive Order 11990 (Protection of Wetlands), or the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act. | | _ <u>X</u> _ |

CX Form (Cont'd.)

AK-040-01-CX-019

| | | YES | NO |
|---------------------------------------|---|----------------|----------|
| | hreaten to violate a Federal, State, local or tribal law or requirement apposed for the protection of the environment. | | <u>X</u> |
| I certify that non Appendix 2) app | e of the Departmental exceptions listed in the above Part B (516 DM 2 ly to this action. | 2, | |
| Remarks: | | | |
| Preparer(s): /s/ | Kathy A. Stubbs Date: 07/11/01 | | |
| | | | |
| | PART III - DECISION | | |
| the proposed pro- environmental ar | this plan conformance and NEPA compliance record and have determined is in conformance with the approved land use plan and that no furthallysis is required. It is my decision to implement the project, as descreasures either identified below or stipulation(s) attached in this case file | ther ribed, | |
| Mitigation Meas Remarks: | ures/Other Remarks: | | |
| Authorized Office | tial: /s/ Stu Hirsh Date: 07/16/01 | | |